RECEIVED

BEFORE THE

Federal Communications Commission

JAN 3 0 1995

WASHINGTON, D.C.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In the Matter of

Petition of the People of the State
of California and the Public Utilities
Commission of the State of California
To Retain Regulatory Authority Over
Intrastate Cellular Service Rates

PR Doc. No. 94-105

OCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

COMMENTS OF THE CELLULAR TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION IN RESPONSE TO THE COMMISSION'S JANUARY 25, 1995 ORDER

The Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association ("CTIA")¹ respectfully submits these brief comments in response to the Commission's January 25, 1995 Order in this docket inviting CTIA to file the raw data underlying the affidavit of economist Jerry Hausman.²

The Commission has granted CTIA just five days (and only three business days) to submit the confidential carrier and market specific data underlying the Hausman affidavit.

As CTIA previously advised the Commission, it has neither

No. of Copies rec'd O CO
List A B C D E

CTIA is a trade association whose members provide commercial mobile radio services, including over 95 percent of the licensees providing cellular service to the United States, Canada, Mexico, and the nation's largest providers of ESMR service. CTIA's membership also includes wireless equipment manufacturers, support service providers, and others with an interest in the wireless industry.

 $^{^{2}}$ Order, PR Docket No. 94-105 (released January 25, 1995), at ¶ 48.

custody nor control of the raw data at issue, which CTIA's member carriers provided directly to Dr. Hausman.³ CTIA is unable to obtain the consent of the individual carriers who submitted their data directly to Dr. Hausman (predicated on a commitment that all market specific data would remain confidential) in the exceedingly short filing window set forth in the Order.

In paragraph 38 of the Order, the Commission states that "the absence of these supporting materials from the record substantially discounts the weight to be accorded Hausman's analysis." The Commission then states that without the underlying data, it will not consider Hausman's analysis in its substantive review of California's petition.

CTIA respectfully submits that even without access to the underlying data, there is no basis for the Commission's decision to exclude the Hausman affidavit from its substantive review in this docket. CTIA submitted the Hausman affidavit with its comments in this docket. Thus, the Hausman study is in the public record. The absence of the underlying raw data has not denied any party the opportunity to comment on the reliability of the Hausman

Id., at ¶ 36.

⁴ Id., at ¶ 38.

affidavit. The Commission has not hesitated in other matters to rely on such aggregated analyses of raw data where access to the raw data is unavailable to it, provided of course that the aggregated analysis is otherwise available for comment.⁵

Dr. Hausman has described fully his methodology in the appendices to his affidavit. The California PUC has long had access to the relevant data for the California markets here at issue, and the sources Dr. Hausman identified as the basis of his other data. Thus, the California PUC is fully able to submit its own analysis to the Commission. The other parties to this proceeding also can use market and carrier specific data available to them through the new Protective Order to rebut the Hausman affidavit with respect

For example, at this month's January 16, 1995 Open Meeting, Chairman Hundt stated that the FCC would rely on aggregated data submitted by the Network Reliability Council, even though carrier-specific raw data would be submitted only to Bellcore and no unaggregated data would be available to the Commission.

Each Appendix to Professor Hausman's affidavit describes a separate regression analysis, specifying, inter alia, the variable, estimate, standard error, and R squared analysis.

I.e., per capita personal income: Survey of Current Business, April 1992 or NPA Data Services; population: 1992 Statistical Abstract or NPA Data Services; mean commute time from home to work: 1990 U.S. Census, Tape File 3c. See Hausman Affidavit, Notes to Appendices.

to the level of competition and the effectiveness of regulation in California.8

As with all information in the record, the Commission must determine the proper weight to accord the Hausman affidavit. CTIA submits, however, that there is no basis to exclude the Hausman analysis from consideration in this docket, and absent any challenge to its veracity, the Commission should rely on the Hausman analysis as demonstrating that the Petition of the California PUC has failed to meet the standard set forth by Congress and the FCC for continued regulation of commercial mobile radio service providers in California.

Respectfully submitted,

Cellular Telecommunications
Industry Association

O Alter L

Michael F. Altschul Vice President and General Counsel

1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 200

Washington, D.C. 20036

January 30, 1995

This, of course, is precisely what the Commission has indicated as being relevant to its consideration of the California petition.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Andrea D. Williams, hereby certify that on this 30th day of January, 1995 copies of the foregoing Comments of the Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association were served by hand delivery upon the following parties:

Mr. William Caton Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222 Washington, D.C. 20554

International Transcript Service 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 246 Washington, D.C. 20554

Andrea D. Williams

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Andrea D. Williams, hereby certify that on this 30th day of January, 1995 copies of the foregoing Comments of the Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association were sent by U.S. mail, postage prepaid to the following parties:

State of California
Public Utilities Commission
Peter Arth, Jr., Esq.
Edward W. O'Neill, Esq.
Ellen S. LeVine, Esq.
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102

National Cellular Resellers Association Joel H. Levy William B. Wilhelm, Jr. Cohn and Marks 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20036

AirTouch Communications David A. Gross, Esq. Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Esq. 1818 N Street, N.W. 8th Floor Washington, D.C. 20036

GTE Service Corporation William J. Sill R. Bradley Koerner McFadden, Evans and Sill 1627 Eye Street, N.W. Suite 810 Washington, D.C. 20006

Mary B. Cranston, Esquire
Megan Waters Pierson, Esquire
Joseph A. Hearst, Esquire
Pillsbury Madison & Sutro
P.O. Box 7880
San Francisco, CA 94120-7880
Attorneys for AirTouch Communications

Alan R. Shark, President
American Mobile Telecommunications
Association, Inc.
1150 18th Street, N.W.
Suite 250
Washington, D.C. 20036

Elizabeth R. Sachs, Esquire
Lukas, McGowan, Nace & Gutierriez
1111 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20036
Attorney for American Mobile
Telecommunications Association, Inc.

David A. Simpson, Esquire Young, Vogl, Harlick & Wilson 425 California Street Suite 2500 San Francisco, CA 94101 Attorney for Bakersfield Cellular Telephone Company

Adam A. Anderson, Esquire Suzanne Toller, Esquire Bay Area Cellular Telephone Company 651 Gateway Boulevard Suite 1500 South San Francisco, CA 94080

Richard Hansen, Chairman of Cellular Agents Trade Association 11268 Washington Blvd. Suite 201 Culver City, CA 90230 Michael B. Day, Esquire
Jeanne M. Bennett, Esquire
Michael J. Thompson, Esquire
Jerome F. Candelaria, Esquire
Wright & Talisman, P.C.
100 Bush Street
Shell Building, Suite 225
San Francisco, CA 94104
Attorneys for Cellular Carriers
Association of California

Mark Gascoigne
Dennis Shelley
Information Technology Service
Internal Services Department
County of Los Angeles
9150 East Imperial Highway
Downey, California 90242
Attorneys for County of Los Angeles

Russell H. Fox, Esquire
Susan H.R. Jones, Esquire
Gardner, Carton & Douglas
1301 K Street, N.W.
Suite 900, East Tower
Washington, D.C. 20005
Attorneys for E.F. Johnson Company

David M. Wilson, Esquire Young, Vogl, Harlick & Wilson 425 California Street Suite 2500 San Francisco, CA 94104 Attorney for Los Angeles Cellular Telephone Company

Scott K. Morris Vice President of External Affairs McCaw Cellular Communications, Inc. 5400 Carillon Point Kirkland, Washington 98033 Howard J. Symons, Esquire
James A. Kirkland, Esquire
Cherie R. Kiser, Esquire
Kecia Boney, Esquire
Tara M. Corvo, Esquire
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris,
Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
Suite 900
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Attorneys for McCaw Cellular
Communications, Inc.

James M. Tobin, Esquire
Mary E. Wand, Esquire
Morrison & Foerster
345 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94104-2576
Attorneys for McCaw Cellular
Communications, Inc.

Thomas Gutierrez, Esquire
J. Justin McClure, Esquire
Lukas, McGowan, Nace &
Gutierrez, Chartered
1111 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20036
Attorneys for Mobile Telecommunications
Technologies Corp.

Jeffrey S. Bork, Esquire
Laurie Bennett, Esquire
U.S. West Cellular of California, Inc.
1801 California Street
Suite 5100
Denver, CO 80202

Leonard J. Kennedy
Laura H. Phillips
Richard S. Denning
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson
1255 23rd Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
Attorneys for Nextel Communications, Inc.

Mark J. Golden, Acting President Personal Communications Industry Association 1019 Nineteenth Street, N.W. Suite 1100 Washington, D.C. 20036

Michael Shames, Esquire 1717 Kettner Blvd. Suite 105 San Diego, CA 92101 Attorney for Utility Consumer's Action Network and Towards Utility Rate Normalization

Peter A. Casciato A Professional Corporation Suite 701 8 California Street San Francisco, California 94111

Lewis J. Paper
Keck, Mahin & Cate
1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Attorneys for Cellular Resellers
Association, Inc., Cellular Service, Inc.,
and ComTech, Inc.

Judith St. Ledger - Roty, Esquire James J. Freeman, Esquire Reed, Smith, Shaw & McClay 1200 18th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 Attorneys for Paging Network, Inc.

Andrea D. Williams